DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 229 PS 017 831

AUTHOR Nissani, Helen; Hitz, Randy
TITLE Parent Education in Oregon: Results of a Department of Education Survey.
INSTITUTION Oregon State Dept. of Education, Salem.
PUB DATE Jan 89
NOTE 34p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Delivery Systems; *Financial Support; *Parent Education; *Parent Participation; *Professional Personnel; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Oregon

ABSTRACT

The Oregon Department of Education conducted a statewide survey of parent education programs in order to identify programs and begin a database which would guide policy. Major findings indicated that: (1) parent education programs were offered by a variety of agencies and groups; (2) approximately 25,000 parents were served by the programs responding to the survey; (3) the vast majority of programs served specific populations; (4) many programs served fewer than 50 parents per year; (5) most programs operated for a full school year or calendar year; (6) many programs did not keep record of the incomes of families served; (7) most respondents said they were able to find qualified staff; (8) parent education programs typically offered a range of services including informal parent support groups, home visits, and formal classes; and (9) respondents clearly believed that more parent education and family support services were needed in their communities. Three issues were identified as needful of change: (1) fragmented program funding; (2) difficulties associated with targeting specific populations in order to meet funding requirements; and (3) the lack of multicultural staff who are proficient in the languages and cultures of Oregon's minorities. Recommendations are offered. Related materials are appended. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED304229

PARENT EDUCATION IN OREGON

Results of a Department of Education Survey

by

Helen Nissani and Randy Hitz

January 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Oregon State Dept. of Educ.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 018331

Oregon Department of Education
700 Pringle Parkway, SE
Salem, Oregon

Verne A. Duncan
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In order to respond to the growing interest in parent education, the Oregon Department of Education conducted a statewide survey of parent education programs. The purpose of the survey was to: (1) Identify programs, and (2) Begin a data base which would guide policy. Questionnaires were sent to every nonsectarian agency and group that could be identified as possibly offering parent education services. Over 900 preliminary questionnaires were sent and 225 were returned. Eighty-five of the respondents met the survey definition for parent education "program" (serving individual parents for at least eight hours per calendar year) and completed a more extensive follow-up questionnaire.

Major findings of the study follow:

1. Parent education programs are offered by a variety of different agencies and groups including schools, hospitals, private nonprofit organizations, colleges and universities, and state and county agencies.

2. Approximately 25,000 parents are served by the programs responding to this survey.

3. The vast majority of programs serve specific populations. Those populations most frequently mentioned are: teen parents, abusive parents, low-income parents, and parents of handicapped children. Only 18 programs serve the general population.

4. Many programs (37 percent) serve fewer than 50 parents per year. Forty-four percent serve between 50 and 500 parents each year. Only ten programs (12 percent) serve more than 500 parents in a year.

5. Most programs operate for a full school year or a full calendar year. However, many individual parents are served for less than six months.

6. Many programs (nearly half) do not keep record of the incomes of families served. Of the programs which keep records, most serve a majority of low-income families.

7. Most respondents said they were able to find "qualified" staff. However, there is some indication that parent educators lack specific skills to deal with certain populations, especially language minorities.

8. Parent education programs typically offer a range of services including informal parent support groups, home visits, warm lines, and formal classes. Ancillary services such as child care, transportation, and information and referral are also often offered.

9. Respondents clearly believe that more parent education and family support services are needed in their communities.

The following is a summary of the issues that were identified by the survey and some recommendations for change.

ISSUE

1. Funding for Parent Education/ Family Support programming is highly fragmented. Much time that could be used for direct service to families must be spent in locating funds.

2. Most parent education programs target specific populations in order to meet funding requirements. This makes it difficult to integrate populations, avoid stigmatizing programs, and establish a truly prevention-oriented focus.

3. Multicultural staff proficient in both language and culture of Oregon minorities are seriously lacking.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. There is a need to explore a source of consistent funding, that will allow for parent education/ family support services to families.

2. Funding needs to be made available for programs serving all families through prevention-oriented services.

3. Oregon must seek, recruit, and train more minority staff members.

4. Although staff can be found for programs, on-site training in intrapersonal and specific skills for specific populations are often lacking.

5. Services for low-income, high risk families are fragmented and difficult to find.

6. Parent Education/Family Support programs exist in relative isolation from one another.

7. Institutions of higher learning must begin to investigate the knowledge base and skills needed, and offer training opportunities.

8. A holistic approach to services for low-income families needs to be developed and mechanisms for interagency communication established.

9. A means for networking interprogram needs, training, and support must be developed.

INTRODUCTION

In the nation today, there is considerable interest in developing programmatic support for families. Large numbers of grassroots parent education and family support programs have begun all over the country, and in some states major programs have been funded. In Missouri and Minnesota parent education programs are nearly universally available through the public schools. In 1987, the Oregon Legislature passed SB 524 and created its own parent education program which is administered out of the Department of Education.

According to Cornell University psychologist Urie Bronfenbrenner, there are several factors which have contributed to what has become a strong "family support movement." Some of these factors are: 1) The rapidly changing conditions of life for American families; 2) a growing disillusionment with social welfare policies; 3) fiscal cutbacks; and 4) developmental research which indicates that the family to a greater extent than any other context, influences the capacity of individuals of all ages to learn and succeed in our society. (Kagan, 1987)

Given the interest in parent education programs and the development of this strong grassroots movement to support and strengthen families, it is crucial that services available to Oregon's families be described and that a continuum of services across the state be established to support Oregon families as efficiently as possible.

The purpose of the Oregon Department of Education Parent Education Survey was to ascertain a description of parent education programs in Oregon and thus provide policy-makers with information they will need to determine how to best serve families. The survey was designed to describe program offerings, methods of delivery, ancillary services, funding structures, descriptions of staff qualifications and training, and descriptions of the populations served.

A similar survey conducted by Maciuika and Weiss (1987) of the Harvard Family Research Project, provided direction for the Oregon survey. The Harvard study confirms that parent education is a rapidly growing field. In fact, this growth is so rapid that "the practice of parent education continues to expand at a rate far faster than that of information in the field" (Maciuika & Weiss, 1987).

According to this national survey, it is difficult to characterize parent education programs as serving one income level, as providing one type of service, or as holding one primary goal. The Harvard researchers also found it difficult to separate family support from parent education programs. This difficulty seems to indicate that most programs are designed to encompass a more holistic approach to helping families rather than providing only parent education services. Family support programming embodies the belief that the family acts as the ecological unit that supports, socializes, and enhances the capabilities of its individual members, be they children or adults.

Similarly, in the Oregon survey we found that no clear line could be drawn to discern parent education from family support programming. According to the survey, many parent education programs in Oregon are offering informal

opportunities for peer support, and family support programs are offering more didactic class offerings or literature. For example, the Linn-Benton Community College Family Resource Program offers parents the opportunity to receive parenting information, as well as support opportunities and encouragement for parents to network and share their resources and strengths. The Crisis Intervention Service (CIS) in Medford offers both crisis counseling and support groups for families in crisis, as well as formal parenting classes. The CIS is also expanding services to the more general population of parents. Therefore, the survey results detailed in this summary describe a new movement in Oregon which combines more didactic parent education approaches with less directive family support services.

This survey could not have been conducted without extensive help from parent educators from around the state and nation. Following is a list of individuals who contributed considerable time and expertise to the project.

Sue Doescher, OSU Human Development and Family Life Dept.
Merrily Haas, Parent/Child Preschools of Oregon
Robin Karr-Morse, CSD Parent Training Services
Laurie Maciuika, Harvard Family Research Project
Cheron Mayhall, Coalition in Oregon for Parent Education (COPE)
Maureen Mooreland, Head Start Parent Child Services
Minalee Saks, Birth to Three Program
Malia Stevens, Central Oregon Community College, Together For Children Program
Alan Sugawara, OSU Human Development and Family Life Dept.
Roberta Weber, Linn Benton Community College, Family Resource Program
Heather Weiss, Harvard Family Research Project

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The present survey was conducted in two phases because (1) the population of parent educators was unknown and we needed to generate a directory of potential respondents, (2) we did not want to burden every program with a long in-depth questionnaire, and (3) it allowed us to focus the follow-up with specific programs. The initial phase began in January of 1988. A total of 957 one-page questionnaires were distributed to all of the nonsectarian groups and agencies we could identify as possibly offering parent education services including a wide variety of public agencies, private nonprofits and schools. Two hundred eighty-three programs, or 29.6 percent of the questionnaires, were returned. Of these, 225 were completed. Sixty-one questionnaires were returned unanswered. The relatively low response rate was expected given that questionnaires were sent to agencies or groups which do not actually offer parent education services. The findings from phase 1 gave a cursory look at the nature of parent education programs.

To answer some of the many issues raised by the preliminary questionnaire, an in-depth, ten-page Parent Education survey was distributed to all of the 225 respondents to the preliminary survey and to an additional 25 programs subsequently identified. This second survey was conducted during the summer of 1988. A total of 120 programs, or 48 percent, responded.

The survey defined parent education as, "any education service rendered directly to parents for no less than eight hours, per parent, per year for the purpose of helping parents to care for their children and build support systems for themselves and their family." This definition was developed by an ad hoc advisory committee of parent education program directors in the state. Of the 120 respondents to the parent education survey, 85 said they met the above definition. The findings in this report reflect the responses of those 85 programs.

LIMITATIONS OF THE SURVEY

1. Before this study, there was no agency or professional organization that maintained a list of parent education programs in the state. Therefore, it was difficult to identify who may be operating a program, and it was necessary to rely largely on the willingness of program directors to voluntarily respond to the questionnaire. This was especially true of the private nonprofit programs many of whom are not linked to any state group or agency.

2. Time and fiscal constraints made it impossible to survey sectarian programs.

3. The definition of "program" eliminated all those which provide parent education services to individual parents for less than eight hours in a calendar year. The purpose of having this definition was to distinguish between programs with ongoing parent education and support services from those that offer merely one- or two-time sessions.

4. No attempt was made to determine whether programs are prevention-, intervention-, or treatment-oriented.

5. Many programs are new and funding is relatively unstable. In addition, programs are continually altering and/or expanding their services. The information in this survey reflects the status of parent education programs as of mid-1988, and thus will need to be updated frequently.

6. Parent education and family support programs are complex and diverse. It seems that no two programs are alike. This made the development of the questionnaire difficult. It also made it difficult for many program directors to answer all of the questions. Certain questions applied well to some programs and not well to others.

CATEGORIES OF RESPONDENTS

Survey respondents were asked to categorize themselves. The following chart lists the number and percentage of programs in each designated category.

Type of Program	# of Programs	% of Total
Private Nonprofit, 501(c)3	27	32%
County Public /Mental Health	15	18%
Public School	15	18%
College/University	13	15%
Early Intervention Program (Special Ed)	8	9%
Hospital	3	4%
State Agency	1	1%
Community School	1	1%
Other	2	2%

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Several questions were posed to ascertain more information about the parents served, the duration of service, the income of the participating families, and the geographic distribution of programs.

A. Respondents were asked to calculate both how many parents and family units they serve per year. The greatest percentage of reporting programs serve less than 50 parents or 50 family units. Seventy-five (90 percent) of the reporting programs serve between fewer than 500 parents per year, and 10 programs serve over 1,000 parents each year.

The ten programs serving more than 500 parents per year are:

Linn Benton Community College, Parent Resource Program
Rogue Community College
Waverly Children's Home
Women's Health Services, Good Samaritan Hospital, Portland
CSD, Parent Training Services
Birth To Three, Eugene
Coalition in Oregon for Parent Education (COPE)
OSU Extension, Master Parenting Program.
Head Start of Oregon
Parent Cooperative Preschools of Oregon

QUESTION: Indicate the categories below which correspond to the numbers of parents and family units served per year.

# of Parents	Number of Programs	% of Programs
Less than 50	31	36%
50-100	22	26%
101-500	22	27%
501-1,000	2	2%
1,000+	8	9%

A total of 72 programs responded by indicating the number of family units served.

# of Family Units	Number of Programs	% of All Responding Programs
Less than 50	34	47%
50-100	16	22%
101-500	18	25%
501-1,000	2	3%
1,000+	2	3%

B. Parent education programs can vary significantly in the number of months or years that they operate and in the amount of time individual parents actually spend in the program. According to this survey, a large number of programs in Oregon (62 percent) offer services for eleven or twelve months each year. Nearly all of the programs (95 percent) offer services for at least seven months each year.

Although services may be offered for seven to twelve months in a year, many programs are intended to serve individual parents for a shorter time. Thirty-five percent of respondents indicated that individual parents are typically served fewer than seven months. On the other hand, twenty-five respondents (34 percent) reported that parents are typically served for one to four years.

Question: How many months does your program offer services each year?

Months of Service Available	# of Programs	Percentage
Less than 4 months per year	3	3%
4-6 months	2	2%
7-10 months	28	33%
11-12 months	52	62%

Question: How long is a parent in your program typically served?

Length of Individual Service Time	# of Programs	Percentage
Less than 4 months per year	14	19%
4-6 months	12	16%
7-11 months	23	31%
1-2 years	14	19%
2-4 years	11	15%
Over 4 years	0	0

D. Parent education programs serve a disproportionate number of parents of infants and toddlers (Maciuika and Weiss, 1987). Sixty-five (seventy-six percent) of all respondents indicated that they serve parents of children birth through three years of age. Only thirty-four (forty percent) of the programs serve parents of children over age twelve.

Question: Please indicate the ages of the children of the parents you serve.

Age of Children	# of Programs Serving Age Cohort	% of Programs Serving Age Cohort
Birth through three years	65	76%
Four through six years	49	58%
Seven through twelve years	40	47%
Over twelve years of age	34	40%

E. Programs were asked to supply information about the income of participating families. Of all the eighty-five responding programs only forty answered questions regarding family incomes. Forty-five respondents said they do not gather family income data.

Eighteen of the programs that do gather family income data serve a majority of families which earn less than $10,000. Another six programs serve a majority of families whose income falls below federally established poverty guidelines ($11,200 for a family of four). Four more serve a majority of families with incomes between $10,000 and $20,000. Only four programs reported serving a majority of families with incomes over $20,000.

With so few programs responding to this question, it is difficult to draw clear conclusions. Most responding programs target low-income families. However, this may simply tell us that programs which gather income data are those which do such targeting.

Question: What percentage of your program participants fall into the following income groups?

Income Range	Number of Responding Programs with Percentage of Participants					
	<10%	10-29%	30-49%	50-69%	70-90%	>90%
Less than $10,000	2	8	5	4	5	9
$10,000-$20,000	8	8	8	3	1	0
Greater than $20,000	5	7	2	3	0	1
Fall below 100% of Federal poverty guidelines	1	6	1	4	0	2

FUNDING PROFILE

Programs were asked to indicate if they are funded by governmental sources, (federal, state, local) and/or nongovernmental sources (fees, fund raising, grant, other). They were asked to give the percentages of funding in each of these categories. Fourteen programs did not respond to this question. A substantial number of programs (all but eight) indicated that they must rely at least in part on governmental funding.

Question: Please indicate your program's source of funding and indicate the percentage of your total annual budget.

(1) Forty-one parent education programs are funded by both governmental and nongovernmental sources. Most funds are generated by governmental monies, and a required in-kind match. Only six of these 41 programs received more than 50 percent of their funds from a nongovernmental source. This means that 35 of these programs receive most of their funding from a government source.

(2) Thirty-six programs are funding entirely with government funds.

(3) A large number of programs (37 programs) reflected a high degree of funding diversity; no one source funds their programs at 50 percent or greater of the total budget.

(4) Only eight of all responding programs indicated that they do not receive any governmental source of funds.

PROGRAM STAFFING

Program directors were asked to complete information that described the qualifications of their staff, the availability of qualified staff, and whether staff have sufficient language skills to serve language minority families.

A. The Harvard survey previously cited found "an enormous diversity in staff background: the two most common staff backgrounds for parent education program personnel

were education and social work" (Maciuika and Weiss, 1987). The present survey results concur with the national study. People with backgrounds in social work, early childhood, education, and nursing are most commonly employed as parent educators. The vast majority of programs require parent educators to have at least baccalaureate-level training.

Respondents were asked to indicate the required degree or training and specific field of study for parent educators in their program. A total of seven respondents indicated that no degree is required, but experience in working with families is necessary. Four programs require a Child Development Associate Certificate or the completion of an AA Degree in Child Development. One program indicated that parent facilitators are all volunteers and experience with adults and groups is preferred.

The chart below lists the number of programs accepting various fields of study as background for their parent educators. The chart lists only those programs which require a baccalaureate degree as a minimum.

Field of Study (Minimum of a B.A./B.S.)	Number of Programs
Social Work	14
Nursing	12
Early Childhood Education	12
Psychology	11
Counseling	7
Special Education/Handicap Endorsement	7
Sociology	5
Education	4
Adult Education	2
Social Service Degree	1
Home Economics	1
Human Development/Family Life	1
Adaptive P.E.	1
School Administration	1

B. Programs were asked if they are able to find qualified staff. Seventy-eight programs (92 percent) said yes and only seven (8 percent) indicated that they have had difficulty finding qualified staff. Three respondents said they have to provide extensive inservice training. Four others indicated that they rely on graduate students or volunteers. Although most of the programs have been able to find staff, comments from those experiencing difficulty are worth noting.

a. "For our last opening, I screened 60 applicants, only 10-12 were at all qualified."
b. "We have difficulty finding staff in rural areas."
c. "Pediatric therapists are very rare."

d. Very few nursing programs include parent education training.
e. We cannot find volunteer childbirth instructors for teen parents.
f. It is impossible to find minority staff.
g. Recruitment is very time consuming and difficult.
h. We can't pay well, therefore 33 percent turn over annually.
i. Part time positions only, poor pay and no health benefits make it difficult to attract quality staff.

C. Programs were asked to indicate the percentage of non-English speaking, minority families in their geographic area. They were also asked to indicate what languages are spoken by their staff members. It appears that relatively few programs employ parent educators who can meet the needs of language minority families.

A comparison of the percentage of minority families in a given area to the available staff who speak languages necessary to assist these families reveals the following:

(1) Twenty-two respondents indicated that from two to fifteen percent of their local populations speak primarily a language other than English (Spanish), yet none of these 22 programs employ a single parent educator who can speak Spanish.

(2) Three of the four programs that served areas with over 25 percent Spanish speaking parents have a number of Spanish speaking staff. One program has only one staff member for a community where 50 percent of the community's families speak Spanish.

(3) Eight respondents indicated that they did not have any demographic figures on the non-English speaking populations.

POPULATIONS SERVED

A. The 85 programs responding to this questionnaire serve a total of approximately 25,000 parents in a year. The vast majority of the programs (67) indicated that they serve very specific populations of parents. Forty-nine of these serve mainly one special group while 18 serve two or more special groups*. The most frequently mentioned special populations served are: teen parents, parents of disabled children, parents of delinquent children, abusive or neglectful parents, and low-income parents. Eighteen programs (21 percent) serve the general population of parents and 34 percent of all the parents served by programs in this survey.

The chart below lists the major populations served, the number of programs serving each chief population, and the number of parents served in each category. The number in the last column represents the number of programs serving the specific population almost exclusively plus the number of "multiple needs" programs serving the specific population. It was not possible to ascertain from this survey the total number of parents served in each population category.

* For purposes of this survey, these 18 programs will be referred to as "multiple needs" programs.

The special population most often served by a program is parents of disabled children. Seventeen programs serve this population exclusively and another five serve them to some extent. From this we know that well over 1,457 parents of disabled children are being served by parent education programs in Oregon.

Fourteen programs serve teen parents exclusively and another ten serve teens along with other groups. More than 822 teen parents are being served by parent education programs.

POPULATIONS SERVED BY PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN OREGON

	Number of Programs Serving One Chief Population	Number Served*	Total Times** Mentioned
Parents of Handicapped	17	1,457	22
Teen Parents	14	822	24
Parents of Delinquents	2	125	2
Abusive Parents	4	354	11
Low-income Parents	5	3,641	15
General Population	18	8,448	19
Multiple Needs (Disabled, Low-income, Teen, Abusive)	18	9,432	N/A
Other	7	515	N/A
Total	85	24,794	

* These numbers are estimates and reflect only the number in programs serving one chief population. Some general population and multiple-needs programs serve additional parents in these categories.

** This number represents the number of exclusive programs plus the number of "multiple needs" programs also serving the specific population.

SERVICE DELIVERY PROFILE

Parent education programs, both nationally and statewide, frequently offer a range of services from informal parent support groups to more formal classes (Weiss & Maciuika, 1987). In the present survey seven definitions were created for respondents to use to describe their service delivery modes. The modes were: parent education classes, parent support groups with trained facilitator, parent support group without trained facilitator, home visitation, warm lines, parent/child classes, and written materials. (See Appendix B for detailed description of the modes.) The delivery modes used for each population listed above were described by the respondents. A total of 85 percent of all of the programs use parent education classes as their primary service delivery mode. The least used mode was that of warmlines, telephone services which provide parenting advice to callers. It is interesting to note that programs use home visitation and parent/child classes quite frequently.

"Any parent" programs seem to be those that offer written materials most frequently. Finally, programs serving parents in crisis or experiencing high stress, i.e., abusive, "at-risk," etc., rarely use support groups as a service delivery mode.

The following chart indicates which of the seven modes identified are used with the above described populations identified by the programs.

Mode Code

one = Parent Education Classes
two = Parent Support Groups With Facilitator
three = Parent Support Groups Without Facilitator
four = Home Visitation
five = Warm Lines
six = Parent/Child Classes
seven = Written Materials

	Number of Programs Using Service Delivery Mode						
Population	one	two	three	four	five	six	seven
Teen Parent	9	7	1	7	4	5	2
Parents of Preschoolers	9	1	1	0	0	5	4
Abusive Parents	5	2	0	3	2	3	1
Low Income Families	4	5	3	6	2	3	3
Parent of Disabled	6	2	0	9	2	6	2
Parent of School-Age	8	1	1	0	0	5	4
Parents of 0-3 yrs old	5	3	2	2	2	2	4
"At-Risk" Parents	7	2	0	5	2	4	2
Any Parent	11	6	5	7	1	9	8
Parents of Adolescents	3	2	0	2	0	1	0
Single Parents	2	2	1	0	0	2	2
Migrant Parents	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
Foster Parents	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Battered Women	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total Number of Programs Using Each Mode	71	34	16	41	15	46	34

B. A small number of programs (sixteen) use only one service delivery mode. The chart below lists the service modes used by these sixteen programs.

Sole Service Mode	Number of Programs
Parent Education Classes	6
Parent Support Groups with Facilitator	1
Parent Support Groups without Facilitator	0
Home Visitation	7
Warm Lines	0
Parent/Child	2
Written Materials	0

C. Programs were asked to indicate the population(s) to which they would like to increase their services and why.

Question: If your agency were to receive additional funding, to which population(s) would you most likely extend or increase your services?

Responses were sorted by population and the reasons given for increasing programming for these populations were tallied. Following is a list of the populations needing additional services and some responses given for this need.

Population Needing Services (# of Programs)	Reason for the Need
1) Low income families (21)	Parents have been turned away, unable to pay. These parents need more help to find services.
2) Parents of newborns pre-and post-natal (18)	A teachable moment. Transition difficult for parents. Most effective time for parent education.
3) Abusive parents (17)	Over 100 on our waiting list (Lane County). Parents need to know more about services. This is the greatest need (Marion County).
4) Teen parents (16)	These programs prevent abuse. Expected growth in population. Very high risk.
5) Parents of disabled children (12)	Families need support and respite. Early intervention services desperately needed for emotionally disturbed children.

6)	Pregnant teens (5)	To promote good decision making prior to birth. This service not readily available to teens. High incidence of infant mortality. Currently, no funds available to provide teens with information.
7)	Everyone (5)	To avoid the stigma of being needy.
8)	Parents with drug or alcohol problems (2)	Need very high in Portland.
9)	Parents of children who do not qualify for services, due to minimal disabling condition (2)	Need support and guidance to services.
10)	Retarded parents with children (2)	Totally underserved population. Very high risk children.
11)	Fathers (1)	We need to explore new roles.
12)	Battered women (1)	These women have a high potential for abuse.
13)	All linguistically different families (1)	Services are now available to only migrant status parents. Much need for prevention.

D. Ancillary services such as child care, transportation, information and referral, and nutrition education are frequently offered by parent education programs in Oregon. These results correspond with a national survey which found the most frequently provided services by parent education programs in order of percentage of use to be: networking for parents, information and referral, parent/child joint activities and child care information (Weiss & Maciuika, 1987).

Question: Please check any of the following additional services provided to parents by your program.

Respondents indicated that they provide the following ancillary services:

Additional Service	Number of Programs	% of Programs
Information and Referral	69	81%
Nutrition Education	38	48%
Child Care	31	36%
Transportation	30	35%
Newsletter	28	33%
Adult Education (e.g., GED)	15	18%
Toy Lending Library	14	16%
Employment Training	14	16%
Drop-in Center	11	13%
Translation	11	13%

Other ancillary services mentioned were: mentoring, recreation, advocacy, health screening, wellness program, AIDs education, library reading materials, case management, speech and language assessments, infant furniture and car seat rentals, sign language, family therapy, respite, food, clothing, group leadership training, financial planning, stress management, and a job bank.

Only six programs (7 percent) indicated that they did not provide any ancillary service to families.

QUESTIONS FOR ALL 120 RESPONDENTS

All of the 120 respondents, regardless of whether they met the survey's definition of a parent education program, were asked to indicate whether there are enough parent education services in their area and what needed services, if any, they are unable to find for parents. Ninety-one respondents (76 percent) indicated that there are not enough parent education services. Twenty (17 percent) said there were enough parent education services in their geographic area. However, the comments of these respondents reflect uncertainty about existing services. Eleven programs (9 percent) did not respond to the question.

Parents, in fact, seem to need many more parent education services than are available. The primary barrier to the lack of services available seems to be the lack of financial resources to develop, implement and expand existing services to families. Over 30 programs clearly indicated that funding limitations have not allowed them to develop needed programs or collaborate with other agencies to do so.

Comments from respondents indicated an insufficient amount of parent education programs, summarized as follows:

1. Underserved areas in the inner city, especially Northeast and Southeast Portland.
2. Comprehensive programs for teen parents.

3. Service for transient Hispanics.
4. Services in the workplace.
5. Teens who are not in school but do not qualify for CSD.
6. Lack of services to identify high risk.
7. More hands-on services, less didactic approaches.
8. More money to offer programs to low income families.
9. Programs for developmentally delayed parents.
10. Access to available programming; transportation.
11. Programs to serve the community at-large.
12. More prevention programming.
13. Funds for publicity of programs.
14. Funds to train staff to use new outreach techniques.
15. More rural programming for Eastern Oregon.
16. Preparenting instruction.
17. Programs without a crisis orientation.

The following information from the comments is also worth noting.

(1) Two programs, one in The Dalles and one in Eugene, indicated that they have extensive waiting lists for their services.

(2) Two school programs said that due to fiscal problems, they did not see this service as a high priority for schools.

(3) Several programs commented on the fragmentation of services and the lack of communication amongst programs in a given geographic area.

There were relatively few comments from those programs indicating sufficient programs in their geographic area. A summary of these comments includes:

(1) Five programs indicated that they were unsure, but felt there was enough programming.

(2) Three programs commented that there were lots of programs, but parents don't use them.

(3) One program said that a center for parenting excellence was opening and this would take care of the problem.

Programs were asked to identify gaps in services to families by indicating services they were <u>not</u> able to <u>provide or refer parents to</u> in their service area. Clearly many programs have painstakingly searched for needed services. It is most interesting to note that many of these services are primarily services that would strengthen low-income families, and thus help them become less dependent upon the state. All parent education programs seek to strengthen the parent so that he/she may successfully raise healthy children. It is necessary to note that the fragmentation of services, the lack of affordability of such services, and the difficulty experienced by professionals and the parents themselves to access such services can be a significant barrier to the effective provision of parent education.

(1) Ninety-eight (83 percent) programs responded to the question about services they were not able to provide or refer parents to. The most frequently cited services that programs are having difficulty in accessing for their families included:

Service	# of programs experience difficulty accessing services
Child care	15
Other parent education programs	10
Transportation	10
Low cost counselling	9
Respite care	7
Low cost medical/dental care	6
Advocacy, help to access social services	4
Housing	3
Programs for developmentally disabled	3
Free classes for low income families	2
Warm lines or referral services	2
Job training	2
Comprehensive teen programs	2

(2) Thirteen programs listed additional services needed for special populations which included:

Public health nurses to visit parents of newborns
Support groups for less common handicaps; i.e., Tourette Syndrome
Preschool interventions for speech/language disorders
Pediatric neurologists
Developmental optometrists
Support groups for parents experiencing marital difficulties
Job training for the unemployed
Low cost family counselling for chemically abusing adults
Low cost prenatal care facilities
Bilingual counselling
Shelters for battered women
Free immunization clinics
Financial planning
Emergency income for two parent families
Extended day care both preschool and after school

(3) Two programs indicated that they are having difficulty finding training resources for their staff and guest speakers on child development for their programs.

(4) Ten programs expressed dismay that they are not able to meet many of the needs of families. For example, one teen parent program indicated that it can only serve teens and their infants for 14 months per teen and service is limited to the parent when the child could also benefit from intervention.

NEED FOR FURTHER STUDY

In spite of the large amount of new information generated by the present survey, many questions remain unanswered. Most notable among them are:

(1) How many parents of children under the age of 18 are there in the State of Oregon?

(2) How many parents of children from particular at-risk groups such as handicapped, abused, low-income and children of teens are there?

(3) Exactly how many parents of children from particular at-risk groups are currently being served by parent education programs?

(4) How many sectarian organizations provide parent education? What is the nature of their services and what populations do they serve?

(5) Are any of the programs doing research to determine the effectiveness of their services? If so, what are they finding? Which programs are most effective?

(6) Which programs provide treatment as opposed to prevention-oriented services?

(7) How much government funding is going toward parent education? What are the relative contributions of federal, state and local governments?

(8) What geographic areas of the state are in most need of services?

(9) What are the sources of preservice and inservice training for parent educators?

(10) What networking, if any, is being done among parent educators?

CONCLUSION

The present survey provides insight into the extent and nature of parent education programs in Oregon. Parent education programs are offered by a variety of agencies and groups including schools, hospitals, private nonprofit organizations, colleges and universities and state and county agencies. Most of them operate in relative isolation from one another. There is no professional organization or state agency that serves to coordinate services or even facilitate dialog between programs.

In spite of the lack of coordination, some common trends appear to be developing. Most notable among these is the inclination of programs to provide a range of services including parent support groups, home visits, warm lines and formal classes. Ancillary services such as child care, transportation and information and referral are also often offered. It is rare for parent education programs to offer a single service such as classes.

Another clear trend is that of targeting services to specific populations such as parents of handicapped children, teen parents, or abusive parents. The reason for this trend is likely due to the fact that funding sources tend to require targeting. Unfortunately, such practices often stigmatize programs and make it difficult for them to establish a truly prevention-oriented focus. It also leads to fragmented and unstable funding.

Research clearly indicates that quality parent education programs can prevent problems for children and families and in the long term save tax dollars. However, if we are to realize the potential in such programs, then a more substantial effort on the part of the state to provide stable funding and coordinate services is required.

REFERENCES

Kagan, S.L., (1987). Home-School Linkages: History, Legacies, and the Family Support Movement. In S. Kagan. et al America's Family Support Program.

Pooley, L.E. & Littel, J., (1986). Family Resource Program Builder. Family Resource Coalition; Chicago, Illinois.

Weiss, H.B. & Maciuika, L.V., (1987). Current Practices in Parent Education Results from a National Survey. Unpublished manuscript, Harvard Family Research Project.

Weissbourd, B., (1987). Design, staffing, and funding of family support programs. In S. Kagan, D. Powell, B. Weissbourd, & E. Zigler (Eds.), America's Family Support Program, (pp. 245-268). New Haven: Yale University Press.

spec971

APPENDIX A
LIST OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS
PRIVATE NONPROFIT

NAME OF PROGRAM	COUNTY(IES)	MONTHS OF OPERATION	PRIMARY TARGET POPULA.	NUMBER SERVED
Head Starts of Oregon	Most	7-10	Low-income	3,000
Mid-Valley Adolescent Center	All	11-12	Families of Delinquent & Neglected Youth	75
Oregon COPE Project, Inc.	All	11-12	Parents of Handicapped	500
Birth to 3	Lane	11-12	Parents of Birth to 3, Teen, & Low-income	733
Grande Ronde Child Center	Baker, Union, Wallowa	11-12	Parents of Handicapped Children	18
Harney County Coordinate Child Care	Harney	11-12	Parents of Low-income & Handicapped	154
Klamath Child Family Treatment Center	Klamath	11-12	Parents of Handicapped Children	250
Klamath Teen Parent Center	Klamath	7-10	Teen Mothers	20
Klamath & Lake County Youth Ranch	Klamath & Lake	11-12	Abusive	40-50
Lane County Relief Nursery	Lane	11-12	Abusive & High Risk	20-25
Learning With Infants & Toddlers	Clackamas, Multnomah, Washington	7-10	Teen Parents, Abusive Parents	115-120
Mid-Columbia Child & Family Ctr.	Hood River, Wasco,	11-12	Single Parents & Handicapped	40
Mid-Valley Childrens' Guild	Marion, Polk, Yamhill	11-12	Parents of Handicapped	50-100
Parent Support Program	Jackson	11-12	Abusive	144
Parents Anonymous--Family Resource Council	Marion	11-12	Single Mothers, Low-income, Abusive Parents	590

Private Nonprofit (cont.)

NAME OF PROGRAM	COUNTY(IES)	MONTHS OF OPERATION	PRIMARY TARGET POPULA.	NUMBER SERVED
Parents Cooperative Preschools	12 Counties	7-10	Parents of	2,500
Parents' Relief Nursery	Douglas	11-12	Parents Under Stress	30
Parent-Child Services, Inc.	Multnomah	7-10	Low-income Parents, Teen Parents, Parents of Handicapped, Retarded Parents	90
Parrott Creek Family Svs.	Clackamas	11-12	Adults of Adolescents & Latency Age	75
Salem Direction Service	Marion/Polk Co.	11-12	Parents of Handicapped	112
Southern OR Adolescent Study and Treatment Center	Jackson/ Josephine	11-12	Parents of Emotionally Disturbed Youth	350
St. Vincent De Paul Child Development Ctr.	Clark, Multnomah, Washington	11-12	Low-income & Abusive Parents	75
Teen Parent	Washington	11-12	Teen Parents	33
The Child Center	Benton, Lane, Linn, N. Douglas	11-12	All Parents	225
The Young Parents Program	Lane, Douglas, Multnomah	11-12	Teen Parents	275
Tigard/ Tualatin Community Youth Services	Washington	7-10	Teen Parents	43
Waverly Childrens' Home	Clark, Washington	11-12	Low-income, Abusive, At-risk	1,500

MENTAL/PUBLIC HEALTH

NAME OF PROGRAM	COUNTY(IES)	MONTHS OF OPERATION	PRIMARY TARGET POPULA.	NUMBER SERVED
Adolescent Day Treatment Center	Clackamas	11-12	Severely Emotionally Disturbed	60-70
Center for Parenting Excellence: La Grande	Union	11-12	General Public	100-300
Community Health	Douglas	11-12	Teen Parents & Low-income Parents	101-800
Family Enhancement Program	Multnomah	11-12	Teen Parents & Abusive	50-100
Jackson County Health Department	Jackson	11-12	Teen & At-risk Parents of Handicapped	250
Natural Family Preservation Project	Klamath	11-12	Families of Delinquents	50
Parents Together	Lincoln	11-12	All Parents	478
Washington County Health Nurse	Washington	11-12	Teen Parents & High Risk Parents	75

STATE AGENCY

NAME OF PROGRAM	COUNTY(IES)	MONTHS OF OPERATION	PRIMARY TARGET POPULA.	NUMBER SERVED
CSD Parent Training	Statewide	11-12	Abusive, Low-income, Foster Families	1,500

PUBLIC SCHOOL

NAME OF PROGRAM	COUNTY(IES)	MONTHS OF OPERATION	PRIMARY TARGET POPULA.	NUMBER SERVED
Beaverton SD	Washington	7-10	Teen Parents	65
Boise-Eliot ECS PPS	Multnomah	7-10	Low-income	80-90
Clackamas ESD	Clackamas	7-10	Parents of Handicapped Children	25
Laurel Elem-- Junction City	Lane	7-10	All Parents	30-50
Douglas ESD-EI	Douglas	11-12	Parents of Handicapped	16
Gladstone SD	Clackamas	7-10	Mothers of Preschoolers	80
Harrisburg Elementary School	Linn	74	Parents of Students	10
Klamath Falls City Schools	Klamath	74	All Parents	120
La Grande SD	Union	7-10	Parents of Elementary Children	20
Lake County ESD	Lake	7-10	Parents of Preschool Children	48
Marion ESD	Marion	7-10	Low-income Migrant Linguisti-cally Different	85
McMinnville SD	Yamhill	7-10	Low-income	15
Mill-City-Gates SD	Linn, Marion	7-10	Abusive & Low-income	750
Umatilla/ Morrow SD-EI	Morrow	7-10	Parents of Handicapped Children	8
White Shield School PPS	Portland	11-12	Teen Parent	34

COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY

NAME OF PROGRAM	COUNTY(IES)	MONTHS OF OPERATION	PRIMARY TARGET POPULA.	NUMBER SERVED
OSU Extension: Master Parenting	All	11-12	All	750
Chemeketa CC	Marion, Polk, Yamhill	11-12	Students	400
Clackamas CC	Clackamas	7-10	All Parents	60
Clatsop CC	Clatsop	7-10	All Parents	300
Lane CC	Lane	7-10	All Parents	175
Linn-Benton CC	Linn-Benton	7-10	All Parents	1,485
OSU Child Development Center	Linn-Benton	7-10	Preschool Parents	95
Portland CC	Columbia, Multnomah, Yamhill, Washington	11-12	Teen Parents, General Population	440
Rogue CC	Jackson/ Josephine	7-10	Parents of Handicapped/ Teen/Low-income	2,000
Tillamook Bay CC	Tillamook	11-12	All Parents	335
Tillamook Bay CC: Teen Parent Program	Tillamook	11-12	Teen Parents	25
Together for Children Central Oregon CC	Crook, Deschutes, Jefferson	7-10	At-risk, General	90
Umpqua CC	Douglas	7-10	Low-income	200

EARLY INTERVENTION/SPECIAL EDUCATION

NAME OF PROGRAM	COUNTY(IES)	MONTHS OF OPERATION	PRIMARY TARGET POPULA.	NUMBER SERVED
Benton County EI	Benton	11-12	Parents of Handicapped	20
EI Free Preschool	Josephine	11-12	Parents of Handicapped	60
EI-Parent Training	Linn	11-12	Parents of Handicapped	40-45
Jefferson County EI	Jefferson	11-12	Parents of Handicapped	60
Klamath Falls EI	Klamath Falls	11-12	Parents of Handicapped	30
Multnomah EI	Multnomah	11-12	Parents of Handicapped	95
Parent Training	Josephine	11-12	Parents of Handicapped	20
Wallowa County EI	Wallowa	11-12	Parents of Handicapped	10-15

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

NAME OF PROGRAM	COUNTY(IES)	MONTHS OF OPERATION	PRIMARY TARGET POPULA.	NUMBER SERVED
Canby Community School	Clackamas	4-6	All Parents	30
Jefferson County Teen Parent Program	Jefferson	7-11	Teen Parents	22

HOSPITALS

NAME OF PROGRAM	COUNTY(IES)	MONTHS OF OPERATION	PRIMARY TARGET POPULA.	NUMBER SERVED
Every Woman's Health	Washington	11-12	Married/ Unmarried	50-100
North Lincoln Hospital	Lincoln	7-10	General, Teens	50-100
Womens' Health Services	Clackamas, Clark, Multnomah, Washington	11-12	New Moms	1,000

MENTAL/PUBLIC HEALTH

NAME OF PROGRAM	COUNTY(IES)	MONTHS OF OPERATION	PRIMARY TARGET POPULA.	NUMBER SERVED
Child & Family Treatment Team	Deschutes	11-12	Teen Parents	30
Deschutes County Mental Health Services Alcohol/ Drug Treatment Program	Crook, Deschutes, Klamath	11-12	Substance Abusing Adolescents	50-100
Family Talks	Lincoln	7-10	All Parents	90
Family Support Program	Clatsop	11-12	Teens/At-risk	15
Jefferson County Health Department	Jefferson	11-12	High Risk Infant Mom, Teen Parents, Hispanics	101-500
Josephine County Department	Josephine	11-12	Low-income & Indigent	336
Youth Services Team	Yamhill	11-12	At-risk Parents of Jr/High School	200

dsm/SPEC971
010389

APPENDIX B
SERVICE DELIVERY MODES
(For Questions 11 to 13)

Number	Service Delivery Mode	Definition
1	Parent education classes	Classes constitute both formal and informal learning experiences regarding parenting. They are conducted by trained professional instructors.
2	Parent support groups	Groups of parents who come together to share parenting skills and experiences in an environment facilitated by trained staff.
3	Informal parent support groups	Parent support groups which are not facilitated by trained staff.
4	Home visitations	One to one experiences in which a professional, paraprofessional or volunteer visits the home to share information with parents and serve as a support to them.
5	Warmlines	Telephone lines which have been set up to answer the concerns and questions parents may have about their parenting or their child's development. This service may be to the public at large or only available to program participants.
6	Parent/Child classes	Classes in which parents receive information and skills with regard to their parenting at the same time that their children are served in a children's program. Parent cooperatives or infant and parent classes fall into this category.
7	Written materials	Newsletters, brochures or journals specifically written for parents.